UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Goose and Golden Eggs

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The Progress of Japan

By DAVID STARR JORDAN

Religion in Russia—and Elsewhere

By WALTER WALSH

VOLUME XCIII NUMBER 9

Chicago, May 1, 1924

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 135
The Goose and Golden Eggs.—REV. ALSON H. ROBINSON 137
Jottings.—J. H. H. 138
ARTICLES—
Quotation.—*John Morley* 135
The Progress of Japan.—DAVID STARR JORDAN 139
Religion in Russia—and Elsewhere.—*Walter Walsh* 140
An Interview with Senator Borah.—*The Princetonian* 143
The Thirteenth Anniversary of Leo Tolstoy's Death.—ALINA HUEBSCH 144
POETRY—
A Confucian Temple.—DOROTHY ROWE..... 139
THE STUDY TABLE—
"The Snob."—Reviewed by HARRIET T. COMSTOCK 145
Conscientious Objectors in America.—DORA MAXWELL 146
CORRESPONDENCE—
A "Hit" at UNITY.—DAVID R. PIPER..... 146
Reply.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 146
Metaphysical Healing.—M. H. BROWN..... 147
UNITY Finds a New Friend in Germany.—PAUL KRAIS 147
A Return to the Fold.—DORA C. DEIS..... 147
THE FIELD—
When Conscription Ends.—*Saturday Evening Post* 147
A Pledge Against War.—*The War Resisters' International* 147
Universal Christian Conference in 1925..... 148

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIII THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1924 NUMBER 9

"Who does not know this temper of the man of the world, the worst enemy of the world? His inexhaustible patience of abuses that only torment others, his apologetic word for beliefs that may perhaps not be so precisely true as one might wish, and institutions that are not altogether so useful as some might think possible; his cordiality towards progress and improvement in a general way, and his coldness or antipathy to each progressive proposal in particular; his pygmy hope that life will one day become somewhat better, punily shivering by the side of his gigantic conviction that it might well be infinitely worse."

—John Morley.

Day by day the evidence is growing that all that we have said about Austria is true. We prophesied, it will be remembered, that the loan to Austria under the Auspices of the League of Nations was a mere subterfuge to give the international bankers control of the country for their own profit—that the stabilizing of the currency and the business prosperity which followed the loan were merely temporary—that collapse was certain to come speedily, leaving the plight of Austria worse than ever. In spite of the best efforts of the newspapers to camouflage the situation, disquieting reports have lately been coming from Vienna, as we have noted in these columns. Now the situation is becoming so bad, evidently, that attempts to hide the facts are being abandoned. Thus, in a recent despatch from Vienna in the New York *Times,* we read that "Vienna has narrowly escaped a stock exchange panic" —that "a series of bankruptcies forced the Government into action"—that "many people fear that prices have not yet reached bottom"—that "the worst will come between the middle of May and the first of June"—that "it is hoped to prevent the Austrian international loan from weakening abroad." Added to these financial difficulties is the appalling fact that the krone has begun to fall again. And this is the country "rescued" a little over a year ago by the League of Nations! This is the program of restoration now being applied by this same League to Hungary, and now recommended by the Dawes Commission for Germany! Anybody with an ounce of common-sense—and with no ax to grind! —could tell from the beginning that these policies are nonsense where they are not shameless plunder. But thus is our world governed!

We are sometimes tempted to wonder if we haven't got some kind of an ethical blind spot. At any rate, we constantly have the experience of encountering certain principles, or rules of thought and conduct, which, perfectly acceptable to many of our friends, are to us intolerable. What is often reason to others, in other words, is unreason to us; what is true to others, seems false to us. Take, for example, that familiar maxim, "My country right or wrong"! To many people this is a noble statement of the highest form of patriotism. A great newspaper, the Chicago *Tribune,* read by million of people, carries this motto as a flag at the masthead, apparently without protest from its readers. To us, the sentiment is not only not truly patriotic, but on the contrary is positively immoral. Indeed, we count it one of the most immoral sentiments we have ever seen. Support what is "wrong"? Why, is it ever right to do wrong? We would not think of such a thing as applying this principle to an individual—a thief, a forger, a murderer, an adulterer! How then can we think of applying it to a country, even *our* country? If "my country" steals from another country, as all great powers do, it should be denounced. If it repudiates obligations, it should itself be repudiated. If it commits murder, as it actually did in the Great War, it should be denied support. For the life of us we cannot see why a country in itself commands allegiance! The only imperative, to our way of thinking, is the moral law. Yet in believing this, and in acting upon it, we are obviously "queer," as judged by every popular standard.

Other illustrations of our moral blind spot might be multiplied. At the moment there is one which is particularly troubling us. We refer to the idea recently stated in a letter to the New York *World* in denunciation of that paper's criticisms of President Coolidge. "It should be remembered," says the writer, "that President Coolidge is the head of our Government, and as such is entitled to the respect of every citizen of the United States." Now, we can't see that! We look and look, but we can't see it. We can understand having respect for an office, but we cannot understand why we should necessarily have respect for the incumbent of an office. Indeed, just to the extent that we have great respect for an office, we find ourselves extremely sensitive to the character of the man holding it, and thus inclined to be more rather than less critical of his words and actions. If the office is high, its standards must be also high, and judgments therefore inexorable. We respect the ministry, but not necessarily

the men in the ministry. On the contrary, we denounce them more quickly and sharply for wrong-doing than any other men—and rightly so! The same holds true of the Presidency, doesn't it? The occupant of that mighty office can be pardoned no lapse, and thus must be subject to remorseless criticism. So at least it seems to us! Yet the average man will hotly proclaim that we should respect a man just because he is president, no matter apparently what he does. To us, we repeat, this is all sheer nonsense. We have not an atom of respect for Calvin Coolidge save what he wins from us by wisdom, courage, fidelity, and consecration. If these qualities do not appear, we see nothing in his office to protect him from the contempt of men.

Gandhi has had a brand of cigarettes named after him! So reports the *Continent* (February 14), which counts this as a final indication of the Mahatma's popularity. So it is, judged by western standards—and an honor, too, if the names we have seen on cigarette and cigar boxes are any sign. To Gandhi, however, the incident is utterly abhorrent, as of course we would expect.

"Of all the abuses to which my name has been put," he is quoted as saying, "I know nothing so humiliating to me as the deliberate association of my name with cigarettes."

Gandhi then goes on to say what he thinks about the smoking habit.

"Smoking," he states, "I consider to be a vice. . . . I should be thankful if the unknown firm were to withdraw the labels from the market, or if the public were to refuse to buy packets bearing such labels."

That the firm in question will heed this request voluntarily we think exceedingly doubtful. The fact that they could take such an exalted name in the beginning as a means of "boosting" their wares, shows that they must be far lost to all sense of decency. But that the firm can be persuaded to "withdraw the labels" as a matter of business expediency, seems to us almost certain. For Gandhi's word is law with multitudes of Indians, and this request, therefore, that men "refuse to buy," the occasion for a boycott which would ruin any business in a night. The wider implications of Gandhi's attitude are highly significant, and may well be pondered in this country where smoking is on the threshold at least of becoming an important social problem.

Eleanora Duse and Marie Corelli, dead on the same day (April 21), were two of the most famous women of their time. Of the latter we know nothing, except that she was a bold spirit, a sincere and dauntless fighter, in many ways a great personality. Of her books we never read a word, and we are quite ready to accept the critical judgment that they were not literature. We agree with the New York *Times*, however, that

while she belonged to the literary proletariat, . . . books worse than hers are published every day by authors whom the reviewers treat with the respect which they withheld from Miss Corelli.

Of Eleanora Duse we can also speak from little personal knowledge. We saw her for the first and only time on this present tour which ended so tragically in death. She left us absolutely unimpressed, save by the conviction that she was a broken woman, using the remnants not of great art but of great personality to achieve her ends. Certainly, there was not the slightest suggestion of illusion in her work, not the slightest attempt at characterization or impersonation. The audience was not a particle interested in either play or rôle, but only in a woman of wide fame and tragic mystery. This raised, and still raises, the question in our mind as to whether Duse was ever a great actress as distinguished from a great and strange personality. Booth, Salvini, Irving, Ellen Terry, Sarah Bernhardt—these names suggest what acting means to us. And through a whole afternoon, we watched this Italian woman, trying to find something of this sort, but could not detect a trace. Of course, as we have said, she was a broken woman—but, in the shattered fragment of the Parthenon, we can see the vision of the temple! We are inclined to believe that Duse was a superstition, not a reality. It was her mysterious personality and not her dramatic art, which won the world.

Inspiring, still mightily inspiring, is the news that keeps coming to us of the action of church sentiment in opposition to war. Forty-five students and faculty members of the Yale Divinity School have sent the following letter to President Coolidge:

We, the undersigned members of the Yale Divinity School, feel that war is not in accord with the Christian principle of love. We respect our Christian brethren who think otherwise, but, for ourselves, we cannot support war. We respectfully urge the administration to further every measure for its prevention, and for the promotion of international goodwill.

More decisive is the sentiment expressed by the National Conference of Methodist Students, held at Louisville, Ky., on Easter day. After passing a resolution presented by the Committee on War, which advocated among other things the abolition of military training in colleges and universities, the question of pacifism was put squarely up to the delegates. It was presented in the form of a questionnaire, as an expression of individual opinion, with the following results:

1. I believe a program of preparedness is an effective method of preventing war and should receive my support. Thirty-one voted in the affirmative, 197 against and 99 were non-committal.
2. I believe that widespread education against war is an effective method of preventing war and should receive my support. For, 334; none against and 3 non-committal.
3. I believe the international organization such as the League of Nations and the World Court should be supported as a solution of the war problem. For, 304; 2 against and 14 non-committal.
4. I believe that war is wrong and un-Christian and that I will not participate in it or sanction it. For, 79; 106 against and non-committal, 141.

We find both of these reports encouraging, not only

because of the action taken and the opinions registered, but also because of the youth of the persons participating. It is the young people who are here waking up on this subject, and, by their own sheer vigor and consecration, injecting a new spirit of life into the churches. If this spirit holds—and why should it not? —the church of the next generation will take an attitude toward war so radically different from anything known hitherto, that a new epoch in religious history will be at hand. For ourselves, we must confess that we have never felt quite so hopeful of the churches on the war issue as we feel today. We kow that it is easy to talk peace now—that the test of sincerity will come when the next war makes its appearance; but meanwhile these current demonstrations constitute an admirable preparation for the test, and at least constitute a pledge which cannot be repudiated without final and perfect dishonor.

The Churchman joins the *Christian Century* in asking the churches to outlaw war by firmly announcing to the world, and particularly in each case their own government, that they are through. "The Christian church," it says (March 22nd), "can stop war whenever it really makes up its mind to do so. If the constituency of every church in every nation in the world would inform its government" that it "can take no part in any movement toward war," there would be no such movement. We could wish that the *Churchman* had said more explicitly "no part in war," but this does very well for a starter. The meaning is plain. Now let this challenge be put right up to the Episcopal church. And to other churches too! The Unitarians are a good instance. This very challenge was put up to the directors of the American Unitarian Association, and was met characteristically with "no action." Now let it be put up to the annual meeting of the Association, in the full glare of publicity, and see what happens. Let a resolution be introduced, for example, in the exact language, word for word, of the sublime resolution so nobly adopted by the Methodists at their meeting in Pittsburg the other day. Let it be stated that this is a Methodist resolution, and has the sanction of a majority vote of Methodists! Then insist upon a vote, and let the apologists for war be counted along with those who, in fidelity to Jesus, are through with the accursed business for good and all. The fight for the release of political offenders was fought in this way year after year, and finally won! Why should not this greater fight be fought and won also?

The Goose and Golden Eggs

To those who insist upon knowing the point first and hearing the story afterwards, and who don't mind a bit of inflated analogy, it may be immediately revealed that Democratic Institutions are the golden eggs, and Public Opinion is the goose. Lord Bryce in one of the chapters of his "Modern Democracies" makes the statement that public opinion is the real ruler in America.

> There exists a judgment which is imperfectly expressed through legislatures, is not to be measured by an analysis of the votes cast at elections, is not easily gathered from the most diligent study of the press, but is nevertheless a real force which all are trying to discover and nearly all to obey.

If this statement of Lord Bryce's be true, the situation which confronts us today is obviously conspired to give us pause. As regards its intelligence and sensitiveness to moral issues, public opinion has probably never stood at so low a level in the history of American democracy. It may sometimes be difficult to tell whether this weakened state of public opinion is a cause or result of the present political and social degeneracy. There are, however, certain conditions which have made almost inevitable contribution to the weakening of this fibre.

In the first place, private judgment has not only almost ceased to exist, but most persons have largely lost the faculty of judging for themselves the merits of any given political or social situation. Mr. John Hobson, than whom there is no more penetrating observer of tendencies of this sort, has said that the unconscious surrender of so many educated persons to the ravages of the herd mind in the years of the war, has been a disconcerting exhibition of the instability of the higher qualities of personality. From the irreparable injury to those finer elements of personality, not one among us has ever recovered, nor will he ever be able to do so.

Tragic, however, as this withdrawal of the exercise of private judgment as a contributing factor in public opinion, it is by no means the worst of the dangers which have befallen us. Probably one of the most iniquitous devices with which American democracy has ever had to struggle, and certainly one which may be counted the deadliest enemy of public opinion, is the positive manufacture of a common mind by means of propaganda. To those who were nurtured upon the tradition that democracy concedes, among other things, the right of every person to be wrong; together with complete freedom to give utterance to his erroneous opinions, there is something hateful about the very word propaganda. Its method consists in a wholesale planting of opinions on a contagious mind in which little or no regard is paid to the personal make-up of the recipients. Doubtless the most flagrant example of this undermining tendency is to be seen in the development of the daily newspaper.

Probably the most outstanding example of venal corruption is that which has come to us concerning the state of the newspapers of France. It has now been established by undoubted documentation that from the

year 1904 until the Soviet Government called the game, there was a systematic bribery of the French press by the Russian Czar and his associates. This was the period when the Franco-Russian Alliance was formed and the first Russian revolution put down in a bath of blood. We now know that these world stirring events were made possible by the sale of Russian bonds to the French peasants; while the French peasants were enticed into the separation from their hard-earned and scanty savings by the corruption of their own press.

Happily for public opinion in America, we are spared the distress of that sort of corruption, so far as we know. But one wonders what would happen to Mr. Horace Greeley, for instance, if he could see how completely the journal which he established and maintained with such conspicuous success, has fallen from its high estate. Mr. Gamaliel Bradford says that the impersonality of what Mr. Greeley wrote "at once developed egotism, and was benefited by it. You could not help feeling yourself a big man, when you were swaying the minds of millions; and the bigger you felt yourself, the more you swayed." All of which may be true with reference to the attitude of Horace Greeley towards the readers of the New York *Tribune*. But you always knew that you were being confronted by the opinions of Horace Greeley, however impersonal it sounded. There was never anything underhand about it, never any propaganda, and if you failed to know what was happening to you or how it was being done, it was your own fault.

Here then in the tragic and increasing inability of many persons to use their own minds on the one hand, and the ready ample supply of manufactured opinions painlessly administered upon the other, are two of the great forces which among others lead inevitably to the breakdown of a wise and enlightened public opinion in America. Mr. Frank Vanderlip is trying almost single-handed to show to the American people what the interpretation of the present situation is. There can hardly be a more humiliating or tragic commentary upon the state of mind of a large group of persons, than the observation of a representative business man the other day, to the effect that Mr. Vanderlip was hurting business.

Can the goose be brought to life, and the golden eggs recovered from refrigeration? That is a very difficult question to answer. It may be that we have set in motion forces which have already gone beyond our control, and that we can only adopt certain devices which may diminish the speed of our descent and then calmly resign ourselves to eventual catastrophe.

It is quite certain that one of the things which we need to recognize is that our present society is a very sick person. Any doctor will tell you that the great majority of cases of illness are likely to bring out the worst mental and constitutional traits which a person possesses. Now let us acknowledge that we are sick and that these prejudices with which we view other people and other races are a perfectly natural consequence of the distracted condition of society, and that they are not based upon any real inferiority of those whom we hold in scorn.

Another element hardly to be over-emphasized is the need for frank and free discussion of all the issues which may cause social maladjustment however likely such discussion is to arouse emotion or to injure business. The teachers in the public schools today say that one of the most difficult problems which they have to face is to get any individual reaction from their pupils; the pupils simply pour out what has been given to them. There are, of course, many who would eagerly suggest that the influence of religion may provide us a way out of our dilemma. As religious organizations stand today, however, it is hard to see the force of such a suggestion. It is a fact, however, that democracy and public opinion are very definitely within the field of religious values; and if religion has any contribution to make to the individual or collective life of man, it is embodied in the affirmation of Jesus, that man shall not live by bread alone.

Alson H. Robinson.

Jottings

The way the Republicans find comfort these days would make a hen laugh. Senator Pepper found it in the fact that only 30 per cent of the Cabinet was corrupt or incompetent. Secretary Hughes finds it in the fact that there are "crooks in every party." And yet these speechifiers have got to find comfort somewhere, and if not in stuff like this, then where?

Strange how circumstances alter cases! "You will search in vain," says Mr. Hughes, "for a more ideal executive than President Coolidge." Mr. Coolidge is the same man today that he was a few months ago. Yet before Mr. Harding's death the Republican managers were planning desperately to nominate somebody, *anybody,* as Vice-President, to relieve the ticket of the incubus of the impossible man from Massachusetts.

In Soviet Russia, we are told, they put grafters to death. A man who takes a bribe, or in any other way sells out his government, is stood up against a wall and shot. If we did that sort of thing here in America, we fear that even the most lurid tales of massacres in Moscow would be as kindergarten stories in comparison with the grim reality in Washington.

Mrs. Edith Rockefeller-McCormick has just bought a necklace worth $1,500,000. This awakens memories of what used to be done by the French *seigneurs* and their dames in the days before the Revolution. It also stirs portends, in times like these, of similar results.

Set us down as opposed on general principles to Japanese exclusion, and as opposed very particularly to the particular method of exclusion recently perpetrated by Congress. The whole thing strikes us as an outrage which ought to be followed by what the Japanese ambassador has called "grave consequences," especially to the United States Senate.

The proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution has been reported favorably to the Senate, and thus stands in a fair way to being passed. Write your senators at once and ask their support. J. H. H.

The Progress of Japan

A little over a year ago I spent some time in Japan, the third visit I had made to that country. While I was there a number of historic events occurred, most of them in response to the Washington Conference, which was intended to abate the cost of army and navy and their menace of war on the Pacific Ocean.

First the Japanese armies were drawn out of Siberia, a region they had invaded at the request of the allies, but they took too many troops and stayed too long after the play was over and the curtain had fallen. Then they took their troops from the Yangtse valley and from Shantung, turning back to China what they had won from the Germans. Next they turned over the revision of school text books of history and biography to a committee of the Women's Peace Party, headed by Madame Yukio Ozaki, wife of Japan's leading opponent of war, and to Madame Hide Inouye, dean of the Women's University of Tokyo. The revision, which took effect in April, 1923, provided for the rewriting of the books on history used in the Grammar Schools by omitting all glorification of war and war heroes and all criticism of rulers or people of other nations. The reading books of this grade tell of 400 heroes: all these with bloody hands were now cut out and men from other lands were included. Among these is Washington, praised for his persistent devotion to his people; Lincoln, for his persistent devotion to the cause of freedom; Watt, inventor of the steam engine; Edison and Marconi, for their persistence in invention; Florence Nightingale, for her work in mitigating some of the horrors of war. Meantime, the government kept on scrapping vessels and dismissing officers and men just as they had agreed to do at the Washington Conference. Since that time the earthquake has scrapped other vessels and wrecked the great naval base at Yokusuka. If the Japanese are wise they will let it go at that, for if a great navy increases the chances of victory, it likewise increases the danger of war, and to keep out of war is the highest interest of every nation.

The reasons for all this are interesting. First, Japan had proposed to do most of these things, and they claim, truthfully I think, that their governments have never broken their pledges. The next reason is the heavy burden of debt and ruinous taxation which is felt in the high cost of living, which rises faster than wages can. The same influence affects the rich as well as the poor, for high taxes and large overhead expenses slow up all forms of industry.

The military group, in Japan and elsewhere, short-sighted and obstinate, being mostly educated in Germany, had favored Germany during the world war, believing that her brass-bound social system was ideally perfect. Now they had come to recognize that they had been mistaken, and being repudiated by the people were fighting with their backs against the wall. If Japan ever was a militarized nation she has now fully recovered from the illusion. Japan has her internal troubles, as every nation moving towards freedom has them. The change from feudalism to democracy is no light task. No nation has reached perfection in government nor has any come anywhere near it. Government by the people demands intelligence of the people and the most important business of any nation is education. For the future of the nation is written in the schools of today. A nation should not be judged by the progress it has made, but by the direction in which it is going.

The chief external embarrassment of Japan comes from the open sore which some of our politicians in California are so anxious to keep from healing. The anti-Japanese agitation on this Coast is not directed against immigration. That has been settled for sixteen years by the Gentlemen's Agreement, not violated in a single case. This the Japanese would like to replace by an open Treaty carrying out the same provisions. There are few people in Japan or America who favor unrestricted immigration. As to that each nation must consider its own interests. The crucial point lies in the treatment of Japanese legally resident here whom we have deprived of rights long held without question. A proud, enlightened, and sensitive people does not like to be snubbed. This matter of discrimination touches our own honor even more than it does the interests of Japan. One of the best things I ever heard Roosevelt say is this, "It always pays, Dr. Jordan, for a nation to be gentleman." DAVID STARR JORDAN.

A CONFUCIAN TEMPLE

I have gone with a friend to a temple
High on a grave-grown hill,
And we found there no priests and no idols,
Found but the magic thrill
Of great loveliness held in deep silence,
Watched by the cypress trees;
And the swift, soundless passing of rice birds
Swayed by a southward breeze.

DOROTHY ROWE.

Religion in Russia—and Elsewhere*

Before coming to a definite conclusion about any Russian affair, it is necessary to survey it in the light of the following considerations: First, the general unreliability of newspapers when swayed by patriotic considerations, and owned, as they mostly are, by powerful press lords with peculiar interests of their own to serve: Second, the special unreliability of news concerning Russia, which is a land of rumors, and the subject of wilful misrepresentation on the part of the financial and imperial powers of nearly every other country in the world: Third, the general willingness to utter and to believe lying reports about Russia's internal affairs, not because Russia is more sinful, but because she is, or has attempted to be, socialistic, and might have succeeded in her great experiment but for the opposition of French and British imperialism. But is it any worse to utter false reports than false coins? Yet the utterer and willing receiver of base coin is heavily punished, while the utterer and receiver of base lies, which are infinitely more wicked and mischievous, may become a big man in his church and his political party. We send the coiner to jail, but, in this country at any rate, we send the international slanderer to the House of Lords or Lambeth Palace.

Mark, now, how a plain tale shall put them down! On the 29th of March, the *Times* quoted an article purporting to be from the Russian Communist journal *Pravda*, of date March 18th; with this difference—that the article was made to appear like an official deliverance of the District Commissariat, instead of being, as it was, an unofficial opinion of a Communist paper. That was the first breach of the Ninth Commandment—false witness number one.

The second breach was committed by the insertion of a sentence that was not in the original *Pravda* article,—

> Although we have declared war on the denizens of heaven, it is by no means easy to sweep them from the households of the workmen.

Then arose a mighty tempest in the ecclesiastical teacup. Forthwith, in the *Times* of 13th April, there appeared a letter of protest above the signatures of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Jewish Chief Rabbi, Dr. Horton, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. John Clifford, and some others, while the flaming lie, "War against religion," burned its way to our brains from almost every news-board. The Roman Catholic Cardinal Mercier—of German atrocities in Belgium fame—appears to have gone one better. He is reported to have written an article for the Roman Catholic paper *Columbia*, published in New York, suggesting that the League of Nations should start an international crusade against the Russian Soviets, in order to wipe out barbarism—presumably by wiping out the barbarians—and to safe-guard civilization, obviously by sending to a better world some more millions of the peasant men, women, and children whom war, plague, and famine—more merciful than he—had yet spared. Nothing like a Cardinal Archbishop for civilizing the world!

I am greatly indebted, as we all are, to Mr. Brailsford, editor of *The New Leader*, for his exposure of the ill-judged and bungling libel indulged in by His Grace of Canterbury and his confederates. From his knowledge of Russia and its language, Mr. Brailsford looked into the matter, and published the disastrous fact—disastrous to the pious breakers of the Ninth Commandment, I mean—that the sentence quoted was not to be found in the *Pravda* article at all. Fuller search was made, and a somewhat similar sentence was found to have been printed in the *Pravda* of two days earlier date, March 16th, and has been translated by Hagberg Wright of the London Library:

> It is not easy now when war has been declared by the godless to sweep that which is divine from the homes of the workmen.

It would be hard to decide what that cryptic utterance really means, but in any case it looks less flamboyant than the *Times* mistranslation, which was serious, in that it made it seem that the Soviet officials were minded to enforce attendance at Rationalist lectures. Even had that false been true, it would have been but a belated imitation of the churchmen of the Middle Ages, who, once a year, on "Holy Cross Day," drove the Jews forcibly to church, and compelled them to listen to a Christian sermon. However, Bolshevism at its worst was never so depraved as the churchmanship of the Middle Ages.

Mr. Brailsford's summary of the whole *Pravda* article gives no countenance to the "War against religion" theory: The article, he says, was a lament that the anti-religious propaganda of the party was meeting with no success. The classes which were held for that purpose were at first well attended, but everyone was now busy, and the circles were dispersed. The result would necessarily be the growth of all sorts of religious sects. Such lack of zeal in the party must be overcome. Every local Communist group ought to have some of its members set apart for anti-religious propaganda among the masses. More lecturers were wanted, better organization, and better discipline.

What in the name of common-sense is there in all this to make an outcry about? There is nothing more—and maybe a good deal less—than is printed periodically in the pages of, say, *The Freethinker*, the organ of Secularism, *The Literary Guide*, the organ of Rationalism, and some others. To twist it into a semblance of religious persecution was to mislead the British public, and to libel a large section of the public of Russia. It proves nothing but that which everyone knew before,—that the Russian Communist Party is actively anti-clerical, and that it carries on its propaganda with doubtful success, a result which many in this country who are not Communists will learn with regret. The Russian anti-clericals are doing no more in their country than the Secularist Society and the Rationalist Association are doing in our own. Should we not feel justly aggrieved if Russian newspapers were to reproduce strong articles from the sectional organs I have mentioned, and hold them up to the Russian people as proofs that the British government was making war on religion?

Mark the next step in this unfortunate episode. Confronted with Mr. Brailsford's exposure, the Archbishop of Canterbury, through his private secretary, admitted that the quoted sentence was not contained in the original *Pravda* article, though a milder version had appeared in an earlier issue, and then proceeded to argue that the letter of protest was in no way dependent on the *Pravda* sentence, significant as that was, for he was in possession of other evidence, therefore

*An address delivered at the Free Religious Movement, Steinway Hall, London, England.

the quotation retained its value. Such is archiepiscopal logic: admit that the proof is fallacious, but maintain the charge! What is the nature of the other evidence referred to? Why is it not published, that it may be examined and sifted? But no, lest it too should turn out to be a mistranslation, a half-lie, or a positive forgery.

When we turn from the Archbishop to Dr. Horton, we fare no better. He informs *The Daily Herald* that he regards all reports from Russia with suspicion, and was not in the least influenced by the alleged utterances; he is even willing to believe that the Russian Bolshevists are more tolerant than are our own; after which he valiantly concludes that he will always raise his voice against religious persecution! In other words, it is quite probable that the evidence is false, but he will nevertheless protest bravely against a crime that has not been committed, thus lending his name to the sin of international libel, leading all the world to conclude that Russia is a guilty persecutor. Ah, my dear Dr. Horton, it is very well to protest against religious persecution—especially when it has not been committed—but what about religious slander? What about the Ninth Commandment?

Turn we to Dr. Scott Lidgett, who boldly avows that his judgment remains unaffected by the sifting of the evidence; his judgment was drawn from other sources, which, however, neither does he reveal; which leaves us wondering what archives are secreted in these ecclesiastical pigeon-holes, and what secret diplomacy is going on among the churchmen of the world!

Principal Garvie, for his part, is very angry that any one should even *ask* for evidence. Is it not enough that one bishop has been executed, another clapped in jail, and a third is being put on his trial? Any slander, apparently, is good enough to be launched against rulers who are capable of making priests responsible to public law! Dr. Garvie is a Non-conformist, and knows full well that the civil and religious liberties for which Nonconformity has contended have been gained in the teeth of stubborn resistance and persecution from the priesthoods of the world. I ask him in all seriousness,—Does he really mean that ecclesiastics shall be exempted from submission to the laws of their respective countries? Shall they—alone of all the different classes of population—remain free to concoct measures for overturning governments to which the people have given their allegiance? This is Ultramontanism with a vengeance! I think the Vatican has never claimed so large a measure. None should know better than Dr. Garvie that the monk's hood and the cardinal's red hat have been the sworn foes of freedom in every part of the world; that all down the ages, popular governments and peoples rightly struggling to be free have never been menaced by conspirators so crafty and unscrupulous as those who hid their wiles behind the sanctity of the altar. Read again Kingsley's "Westward Ho!" for a popular instance.

The Chief Rabbi, I leave alone; for I am incapable of gauging the mentality of a Jewish leader who can put his name to a manifesto the only effect of which must be to assist the restoration of the Romanoff dynasty which has been the bloody enemy of his race through all its existence.

But I want a word with Dr. Clifford, who admitted that he had not read the *Times* article. Why then did he sign the protest? Will it be believed—surely on the strength of his own written words it must be believed—that this famous Liberal and Nonconformist leader signed the protest against alleged persecution in Russia on the strength of proved fact about religious persecution in—*Rumania!* The Baptist Commissioner in Rumania had assured him that in *Russia* the Baptists, being democratic and anti-hierarchical,—in other words, not being plotters against the government, or traitors seeking to restore the Tsardom,—suffered no molestation. Yet he weakly lends his great authority to a letter which, on examination, can be regarded only as a plea for the protection of ecclesiastical traitors. It is certain that Dr. Clifford did not mean that. The great Baptists of history have been the stout resisters of priestly arrogance and ecclesiastical presumption in every land. Why then, under cover of denouncing religious persecution, does Dr. Clifford descend to religious libel? Why does he violate the Ninth Commandment merely because he dislikes Soviet government, which after all is a matter for the Russians themselves?

Let us leave cant and come to common-sense. If a priest plots against the government of this country, and enters into correspondence with its enemies with a view to its overthrow, he must expect to be judged according to its laws, and if he is a man he will not whine about it. If a priest engages in treasonable conspiracy he virtually declares civil war, and if he is visited with the penalty of treason, the shout of "religious persecution" is merely an appeal to sentiment. Surely we believe that judicial administration ought to be impartial, without respect to persons or professional occupations? Is a man's office to exempt him from the common obligation to loyalty? During the black Tsardom it was notorious that the priesthood was its willing tool, and excommunicated the greatest and goodliest man within its dominions—Leo Tolstoy.

Take an opposite case. Suppose that, during the late war, the Bishop of London—instead of telling us, his guileless flock, that Christ was signalling to us from the skies to set our teeth and keep on killing Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Turks—had plotted for a German victory, conspired to bring the Kaiser over to Buckingham Palace and Hindenburg to the War Office, and planned to cut off the heads of Asquith, Grey, and Lloyd George, would he not speedily have found himself transferred from Fulham Palace to the Tower of London? Why then should it be different in Russia? People who back government by bayonet in England can hardly object to it in Russia. If it is right here it cannot be wrong there. If it is wrong there it cannot be right here.

For my own part, let it be here said, I am against the whole vile business of government by bayonet, as being in all countries contrary to right religion; but I decline to shout with those partisans and reactionaries who believe in government by bayonet in their own country, right or wrong, and who disbelieve in it only when it is employed by another country. The real objections of the shouters are not religious but political. It is not religious persecution they are objecting to, but the punishment of plotters with whose reactionary policy they happen to agree. Those who are engineering the movement against Soviet Russia are merely exploiting the credulity of our too willing churchmen to the end that another war may be provoked against the Russian nation. The eternal right of citizens to oppose governments in the sacred name of conscience is one I shall maintain to my dying day;

but this sudden display of zeal on the part of some of the signatories to the letter of protest stirs discomforting thoughts in my mind. When the Conscientious Objectors of this country were crowding our jails through refusal to participate in the government's war policy, I don't recall that the Archbishop of Canterbury, for example, created this uproar on their behalf —no, not so much as the squeak of a mouse.

No other conclusion is open to us than that we have here merely a new phase of the campaign of calumny which has never ceased on the part of the opponents of Soviet Russia, the unavowed object of which is to force this country to break away from its Trade Agreement, and wreck the prospects of recognition; a new phase of that Anti-Soviet hostility which has assumed many unlovely forms since the Tsardom was hurled from its polluted seat. The people who are behind this scheme care no more for the head of Monsignor Butkievitch than they do for the head of Lenin or Trotsky, —or, for that matter, of Dr. Horton or His Grace of Canterbury. The unhappy execution of the Polish Bishop of Petrograd is being exploited only as a means of securing British repudiation of the Trade Agreement, and a complete rupture of relations. It was not a mere joke that Philip Snowden perpetrated when, in the House of Commons, he declared that the Bolsheviks of this country were found among the Die-hards of the Tory Benches. These are the kind of people who are spreading the myth of the Soviet Government's "War on religion." Their ultimate objective is *war on Russia.*

When we come to the real facts of the situation we see that it is ridiculous to talk of religion being persecuted. In Russia there appears to be complete religious freedom—a thing for which in this country we have long struggled in vain. Reliable testimony avers that churches, chapels, and synagogues are in full swing. There is a church in every village, the officials of which discharge their functions unmolested, so long as they respect the laws. Religious processions are freely permitted, ecclesiastical officials of all kinds are recognized, and there is more scope for denominational activities than was the case under the Tsardom. The religious Orders remain in possession of their convents and monasteries—which is more than was granted by Republican France a generation ago, when it was found necessary to drive out the black-gowned conspirators who nested in the church and plotted to bring back monarchy and reaction. We have not forgotten Gambetta's stirring cry, "Clericalism is the enemy!" So it was in the days of France's Republican struggle. So it is in Russia's struggle today—Clericalism is still the enemy.

The facts justify us in going a step further, and in asserting that there is a larger measure of religious liberty in Russia today than there is in England. English law is still disfigured by a set of enactments known as "Blasphemy Laws," which are really laws against freedom of religious criticism and controversy, since they can be put in force whenever heterodoxy becomes offensive to the ruling powers in church or state. In vain have successive efforts been made to secure the repeal of these remaining fragments of the Acts of Uniformity, which can have no other design than to stave off hostility to dogmas and institutions which have more than served their day, and ought long ago to have ceased to be, were it not that they provide well-feathered nests to the foes of thought and progress. The Soviet Government, to its credit, has abolished every kind of discrimination, rightly regarding it to be the duty of the State to give a fair field and no favor. It affords equal freedom to religious and anti-religious propaganda, on the one simple condition that they respect the laws and create no public disorder. I have already drawn public attention to the fact that the Young Communist League organized peaceful pageants and processions designed to show the development of Christianity from the more ancient cults which preceded it. I count the demonstration of that fact of historical religion to be one of the most important contributions to the coming Universalism in religion and politics. It is a fact upon which I find it necessary to insist on every favorable opportunity. Shall there be less freedom in England than there is in Russia? Yes, if our reactionary Die-hards have their way.

Further, the churches in Russia are "free" in the sense that they are not subject to State control in matters of doctrine and internal administration. In other words, while in this country we are still crushed under the incubus of a State-created and State-endowed church, Russia has accomplished the righteous ends of religious equality by the disestablishment of the Church, though it has not yet proceeded to the extreme of driving out the Religious Communities, as did France. Dr. Horton, Dr. Garvie, Dr. Clifford, and Dr. Scott Lidgett are all of that Non-conformist breed which has for centuries fought against the presumptions of a State Church; and it is a thousand pities they have not the breadth of vision and of heart gratefully to acknowledge Russia's fine assertion of the principle of Religious Equality, which is the very foundation of Non-conformity.

It now becomes evident that there are portions of religious Russia—we do not yet know how small or how great they may be—which do not unite with the reactionaries against the Soviet government. The Baptist Dr. Clifford has admitted that the Baptists at any rate make no effort to overturn the Soviet system; and Baptists have historically been in the forefront of the struggle for civil and religious liberty. If in Russia there were anything resembling intolerance, the Baptists might be trusted to put up a fight against it. There is also, as I read, a vigorous reform movement going on within the church itself. A certain Bishop Antonin heads a group known as "The Living Church," and is cordially denounced by Orthodoxy as an atheist and an unbeliever; from which I conclude that he is a sound democrat and a very good man.

Having disestablished the Russian hierarchy, the Soviet government inevitably proceeded to disendow it—in part at any rate—according to the historic program of Non-conformity in this country. But from that act of public justice and religious equality it refrained through the terrible period of civil war and foreign invasion led by Denikin, Wrangel, Yudenitch, and others. No, not even to feed its hungry soldiers, battered and starved before those hired mercenaries of French and British jingoism did it proceed to the sequestration of church property. It was only when famine came and swept its people off by the million, that the Government descended upon the hoarded wealth of the church, and compelled it to disgorge some of the treasure it had wrung from the people through many centuries. The ecclesiastics shrieked "robbery," "sacrilege"! as they always do when their coffers are broken into for the public good—though sometimes for purposes not so good, as witness our own Henry Eighth

and his plunder of the monasteries. It was famine that forced the hand of the Government, and rendered necessary a measure of disendowment, which was requested even by many of the poor clergy themselves. In this country, we made our own little contribution towards the famine-stricken population of Russia; and it was right that a capital levy should be made on the hoarded wealth of the church—much of which must originally have been given for education and relief of the poor, as well as for ecclesiastical purposes.

At any rate it was so in this country, where we are still waiting for the disestablishment and disendowment of a State Church which lords it over us with its immense possessions—including the finest lands and loveliests slums in England—which it has appropriated wholly for its own purposes since the time when the State and the Municipality took over education and poor relief, freeing the Church from the costs, but leaving them the endowments. So are the poor robbed of their heritage. In Russia they have tried to rectify that iniquitous wrong, deeming the lives of the people more precious than the vessels of the altar. When our day of famine comes, we shall do the same.

One last step remained to be taken in Russia's progress towards religious freedom and equality; and that step led from the church to the school. While in this country our national education is still cramped and tainted by sectarian teaching in schools, Russia has advanced to complete emancipation of the young. Our "Secular Education League" has for many years striven in vain to get sectarian education banished from the rate-supported schools of the country, but the priestly elements have so far prevailed over the popular ones, partly because Non-conformity, as represented by those I have already mentioned, is only half-hearted with regard to this part of its program. As France did a quarter of a century ago, so Russia has now *laicized* its schools—that is, it has abolished religious, and anti-religious, teaching alike. It has relieved its teaching profession from a burden of responsibility which ought never to be laid upon it.

The principle of secular education has been carried out more logically than has even been contemplated in this home-land of compromise. All teaching of religion to groups or classes of children is forbidden, which seems to exclude Sunday school, or other teaching of the very young, even in churches. As no other schools are permitted except those which are publicly owned and controlled, it is plain that there can be no group teaching of religion—or anti-religion—to children of tender years; though parents are free to give such home teaching as they please in their own families; and all adults enjoy complete freedom of belief or disbelief. So far, all that is as it should be. Freedom to believe implies freedom to disbelieve. Freedom to go to church implies freedom to stay away. Therefore the Government insist that children of impressionable age shall be left to complete their education in the elementary and secondary schools unswayed by religious or anti-religious bias of any kind.

A sound idea must be admitted to lie at the basis of this policy, although it is a policy likely to break down in practice. It is an idea firmly advanced by Mr. Bertrand Russell in his "Principles of Social Reconstruction." Let a child's free personality be respected, and when it comes to years of discretion let it choose its beliefs and disbeliefs for itself. The immature mind of childhood ought not to be committed to opinions and doctrines the value of which it is incapable of estimating. To my mind this seems good; and I know of parents who act upon that principle as far as they can; but it is probably too good to be fully adopted so long as priesthoods survive with their enormous influence over mothers and family life. Mr. Brailsford sympathizes with the principle, but thinks its enforcement a "rash prohibition" which the church, and earnest men, are bound to oppose and resist. I cannot quite agree with that view. I do not think that either the church or earnest men are *bound* to oppose or *ought* to resist, an educational philosophy so wise; but I much fear that they *will;* and also that they will *succeed;* and the day of perfect emancipation will be postponed.

It is evident that Tolstoy's mighty spirit yet energizes in Russia, to which we must look for the spectacle of a moral courage daring enough to commit itself to a great principle and to complete faith in humanity. England, the land of compromise, lags behind.

London, England. —*Walter Walsh.*

An Interview with Senator Borah

The Senator is a typical son of the Far West and his strong and healthy frame shows him quite capable of carrying out the projects for peace his fertile mind evolves. He it was who first requested the President to call the Washington Conference, and now he is engaged in another undertaking of a similar nature.

Seated before his desk in his office in the magnificent Senate Office Building at Washington, the Senator leaned back in his chair and, musing on the troubled state of the world at present, began as follows: "We are all ostensibly at least for peace, and most of us are sincerely for it. The great question that divides the advocates of peace is how to secure it. There are two suggestions which I feel may be worthy of consideration.

"First is the necessity of getting away from the psychology of the late war. Five years have passed since fighting ceased but in a large measure the war has been going on ever since. Foreign policies are saturated with the war spirit—our treatment of Russia, the invasion of the Ruhr, the building up of vast armies in Europe, the making of military alliances, the whole program is war. Professing peace, the nations of the world are practicing war. A most short-sighted, vindictive policy and one most likely to bring on another world war has been that which seeks to ostracize Russia and dismember Germany.

"The first proposition is to endeavor to get away from this war spirit and to establish amicable business and trade relations with all the nations of the earth. Let us do the simple, sane, practical thing. Let us take up the practices of peace with all nations.

"The second point that I wish to make is that we will never get rid of war as long as war is recognized as a legal institution. Under the present status of international law the United States may invade Nicaragua or Brazil, England might attack France, and both such actions would be perfectly legitimate. Wars of invasion are recognized as legal and war is recognized

as a legitimate institution for the settlement of international disputes.

"Until the public opinion of the world is organized and crystallized into a code of international law condemning war as a crime, and outlawing it as an institution for the settlement of international disputes we will make little progress toward permanent peace.

"Supposing you were writing a code of municipal law and should recognize in that code the right of one individual to take the life of another, should recognize the right of killing as legitimate and simply attempt to control it by prescribing the kinds of weapons to be used. What would be said of such a barbarous code? That is exactly what we do now in international law—we recognize war as a legitimate institution and seek only to control it by limiting and prescribing the kinds of weapons to be used. Every man with common sense knows that that is sheer folly, and that all treaties and leagues amount to but little indeed so long as one nation can attack or invade another without legal or moral condemnation."

—*The Princetonian.*

The Thirteenth Anniversary of Leo Tolstoy's Death

Not many weeks ago The Free Philosophical Association of Petrograd arranged an evening gathering in commemoration of Leo Tolstoy. The title of the address given by friend Kuzmin was "Tolstoy and the Revolution."

"I was living in Tula (county town nearest to the Tolstoy's estate); my comrades and I were busily preparing for the Revolution; some were manufacturing bombs. The police persecuted us severely, arrests followed arrests so that at last it was impossible to find a safe lodging in the city of Tula," related Kuzmin in his introducing notes. The young revolutionists were driven out of the town and Kuzmin found his temporary home with Ivan Gorboonof, personal friend and editor of Tolstoy, living a few miles away from Jasnaia Polyana. Here in a rustic primitive atmosphere Kuzmin met for the first time the great old man, here they had the first talk about the Revolution.

Tolstoy had seen the coming of it and with all the ardor of his great soul longed to direct it into the proper channel.

The resurrection of the *real* man in man was his passionate vision. He considered it the first and the deepest meaning of the Revolution. Concerning this awakening of a man, Tolstoy said once: "Terafein Tarovsky* had a wild bear who loved and obeyed him perfectly, do you think that with the same power you could not wake up the most debased human being? You can do it, I am sure, use only the power of love that is within you." Nowadays we witness the ever present materialistic tendencies made real, we see the consequences of it and we realize that Tolstoy in his forseeing wisdom was right.

A really profound and lasting change cannot come without the slow transformation of the inner self.

Tolstoy was suffering deeply for the unfortunate young revolutionists who happened to find themselves in a critical situation. Once the boys came to him asking for help and advice. The police were after them and they had to cross the frontier in order to save their lives, but they had no passports. Tolstoy was moved and cried desperately like a child. He begged Kuzmin to go to Tula and procure two false passports while the revolutionists stayed temporarily at Jasnaia Polyana. Tolstoy could not remain cold in the struggle started by his people. He sought ways of intercourse with peasants and workers. He arranged public meetings on his estate. The workers came from Tula and the peasants from the surrounding villages. A friend of Tolstoy, Tezertkof, and young Kuzmin made speeches. Leo Nikolajevitch himself tried to speak publicly but failed.

Soon the ever active police ordered Tezertkof to leave the boundaries of Russia. Tolstoy expressed his desire that T. should stay, but the latter went away. What would happen if he disobeyed the official orders? The masses of peasantry near to Leo Nikolajevitch were permeated with patience and decision. The movement that was ripening was the non-co-operative. With the help of Tolstoy's friends his influence was widening.

At the same time Tolstoy was corresponding with the prime minister of Russia, Stolypin, who was the son of his comrade from Sebastopol. With the idea of persuading Stolypin to make some radical agrarian reform Tolstoy tried persistently to induce him to introduce a reform of the Henry George kind. Stolypin did not react promptly and letter after letter came only to shatter the great hope of the illustrious old man. But he continued to use his influence until at last a satisfactory answer came. Stolypin gave his consent and asked for a collaborator, thoroughly acquainted with Henry George ideas who could be the mediator between him and Leo Nikolajevitch. Tolstoy immediately sent a suitable man to St. Petersburg. Suddenly the scene changed. The tzar became informed about Stolypin's plans and the latter lost his favor and influence. Then came his sudden death and his family left in oblivion by the angry tzar.

Thus we learn how Tolstoy tried to direct the inevitable revolution into the proper channels. His all embracing heart could not beat peacefully when the best part of the nation, the blooming youth of workers and intelligenzia were cast into the filthy prisons, shot, hanged or sent to the isolated Siberian regions. At this Tolstoy's pen produces the immortal appeal "I cannot keep silence!"

Finishing his address he was very excited, gave it to every one of surrounding friends to read and was asked constantly, "Well, how do you find it?" Not seldom he heard the answer, "It is weak, it is not what it should be, you do not go to the root of the evil. The peasants have no ground and that is the reason for all." Genius though Tolstoy was, he listened meekly to the fair remarks.

Friend Kuzmin finished his address with the words of profound meaning.

He was our conscience and we are missing him. Tolstoy could go without the Revolution, but the Revolution cannot afford to be without Tolstoy.

The shabby and cold room of The Free Philosophical Association was packed to the limit. During that even-

*A highly estimated old monk who about twenty years ago was pronounced Saint by the Greek Orthodox Church.

ing Tolstoy came to us in a new light. Most of us knew him as a writer who preached non-resistance, vegetarianism and simple Christianity but little was known about his personal attitude towards the Revolution, his relations with the radicals, his steps in the direction of introducing a liberal agrarian reform.

The old familiar venerable figure once more warmed with its message those who were present at this meeting.

To stick to the highest possible idealism, to hold high the belief in the moral sense of the Revolution, these were the chief motives of this meeting.

Petrograd, Russia. ALINA HUEBSCH.

THE STUDY TABLE

"The Snob"*

Mrs. Martin is such a sincere and enthusiastic writer that like the New England conscience she often leans too far backward.

In her "Church on the Avenue" she sets forth the hypocrisy of the ministry in ardent terms and in "The Snob" she attacks the college professor of a small town who caters to the power of the rich and unworthy.

In Eugene Curry, head of the English Department, we have a ready made snob so obvious from the start that one wonders why everyone did not detect him at once.

His own estimate of himself was as "a spiritually-minded Emersonian, Marcus-Aurelian type," and Mrs. Martin tells us that he was taken at that by his associates except Herrick Appleton!

Part First of "The Snob" deals with Appleton's observation. Part Second with Nancy's point of view, Nancy being Curry's wife.

The Leitersville Academy was largely supported by the shoddy, new rich who buy man and God at their own figure and are always pitiful buffoons.

The women of Leitersville in the ugly parlance of the street "fell" for Curry *en masse*. His "beautiful countenance" bowled them over and they found him perfect—even Nancy who marries him and rather crudely, we think, threw him to the mob later, did not seem to suspect the poor creature he was until Appleton—a one-time friend—appears on the scene and opens her eyes. Once her eyes are opened she has no hesitancy in showing her feelings.

Mrs. Martin always gives a charming description of the Pennsylvania Dutch; her dialect, while often confusing, has the ring of truth and in this book, her minor characters—Curry's family, who live too near the academy town, we think—are very well drawn. Hard working, stupid, clownish—they regard Eugene as the romance and beauty of their lives and proclaim this by permitting him to use them to a disgusting extent while he shamelessly flouts them.

That Nancy, finely educated young creature that she was, could ever have been deluded into marriage by the all-too-obvious Snob, is beyond comprehension, but so it was.

She hides the fact that she has money, social position and independence and becomes the slave of Curry and his relatives on the farm where he takes his vacation—at no expense to him. It is here, at the farm, that Nancy meets Appleton, makes him promise not to betray her wealth and his previous acquaintance with her—a pure and guileless one, be it known—and, at the same time, permits him to rescue her from over much drudgery in a most alarmingly, high-handed fashion.

Appleton, recovering from an auto accident, is the guest of Curry's family.

As we read, much as we recoil from certain traits of the Dutch family, they rise superior to Nancy and Appleton, and of course Curry, who, while accepting hospitality, fairly gnaw the hand that feeds them.

Curry, ashamed of his people, sneering at his drudging wife, Appleton, the invalid guest, and Nancy, who is still Curry's adoring wife even while she plays his caddishness into Appleton's hands, are not a happy group to carry on the tale.

No one, among the readers of this book, could doubt Curry's snobbishness from the start. He neither mends his ways, nor gains sympathy—he probably could not.

Once Nancy takes her place in the Academy town, trouble begins. With her secreted money she engages "help" that Eugene resents, thinking, naturally, that it is *his* money used for luxury. She spurns the wretched social system and gets disliked for her tactics.

Appleton is always at hand. If Curry was not such an outstanding snob, we'd get the idea that Appleton was something of a knave.

However, the inevitable occurs. The Snob, true to his type, licks the shoes of the rich and his affections—save the mark!—return to the cheap daughter of the Big Boss. At this juncture Nancy stampedes the situation by announcing that she is the daughter of Sherwin Claxton and the heir to great wealth.

Claxton had been a scoundrel, but an aristocratic one—hence his daughter's blue-blooded action that had so daunted everyone.

"I realize," proclaims Curry, "that you have always shown yourself true blue"—this is rather trying to the readers' credulity and not even Nancy's assertion that "she wanted to be loved—or despised—for herself alone" seems to mend the matter.

Nancy declares that physical infidelity is nothing compared to the gulf that has opened, spiritually, between her and Curry. He then threatens an insane asylum.

The story does not ring true, but Mrs. Martin's Snob is a snob, sure enough; her portrayal of the sordid life of the former; the hypocrisy of the vulgar rich, extremely good.

We wish that Nancy could have been a wiser woman, for one hesitates to imagine her future with Appleton, whom she undoubtedly intends to marry as soon as the disturbing details are ended that will free her from Curry.

"I do believe in the sacredness of marriage," she proclaims; "and can't endure a desecration of it"; so she sets her face to the future and turns her back upon a situation that could hardly have existed if she had been as wise as she is described.

HARRIET T. COMSTOCK.

*"The Snob," by Helen R. Martin. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

Conscientious Objectors in America

No account of the World War and its causes would be complete without the story of the Conscientious Objectors. For this reason it is fitting that Norman Thomas's book, "The Conscientious Objector in America"* should be dedicated "To the brave who went for conscience' sake to trench or to prison." The Conscientious Objectors were as much a part of the war period as were the Doughboys. They were hostile to the war not because they were out of the main current but because they were in the full sweep of the events which brought on the war.

"There were young men," writes a young pacifist in an anonymous autobiography, "who gave their courageous best in the war, in which they saw beauty; and they too, were at the Dionysian crest. Moved by a common rebirth, in different ways we proposed to erect for finality that banner which the Hebrew prophet first flung to the winds; when he said that swords should be beaten into plowshares. We were determined that they should not be beaten into armored tanks, instead."

It is just because the Conscientious Objectors were moved by the same impulses that sent other men, however mistakenly, into the trenches, that it is a little disappointing to find Mr. Thomas devoting so much of his book to an account of the treatment accorded these objectors. Without condoning for an instant the treatment accorded to the Conscientious Objectors by the United States Government, the story of the indignities and even cruelties visited upon them leaves one cold in the face of the greater horrors endured by the men in the trenches and the surpassing atrocity of war itself.

Mr. Thomas's book, however, presents an authentic account of the C. O.'s, their social and political background, the government's policy in regard to handling them (there really was a policy), their life in the camps and the prisons where they were segregated. He quotes liberally from the statements of the men themselves, and these statements were as varied as were the men they came from. There were the so-called "humanitarian objectors" who would not subscribe to any religious sect or creed but who quoted Thoreau and Tolstoy; there were the religious objectors, some of whom had no broad social vision but objected to war in "obedience to Christ," others of whom objected to war as a social evil; there were the I. W. W.'s and Socialists who objected to this war in particular, refusing to fight their fellow-workers in a capitalistic war. All were one in their objection to this war, some agreed in their objection to all war.

These Conscientious Objectors to the last war are barely out of jail, but the roots of another war are already spreading. May the forces of these objectors be so augmented that when the next war comes upon us, there won't be room enough in the jails of the country to house them.

DORA MAXWELL.

*"Conscientious Objectors in America," by Norman Thomas. B. W. Huebsch, New York.

CORRESPONDENCE

A "HIT" AT UNITY

Editor of UNITY:

After reading in your columns repeated statements about the "collapse of the churches," their fitness only for burial, and the utter futility of their existence; and after reading in almost every news letter concerning the travels and itineraries of Dr. John Haynes Holmes that the churches in every town where he speaks are practically empty (while people throng the hall where he is speaking); after all this, then to have you mention the Sunday Schools of these churches first among the forces of America which make the people "familiar with noble ideals"! (Your issue of March 20.) Really, this is a bit disconcerting. Even the Ladies Home Journal, which of course never errs, devoted several pages not so long ago to telling the mothers of America that the Sunday Schools of the country are pitiably and laughably and despicably worthless. What is the matter? Have you been making a real investigation, or is this based upon more guesses by Dr. Holmes? What are we to believe?

Yours cordially,
DAVID R. PIPER.

REPLY

Dear Dr. Piper:

I rejoice in your letter, as you seem to have scored a fair and square "hit" at UNITY's expense; and I always enjoy a point *against* me as much as a point *for* me. I enjoy it the more, being human, since I myself am not personally involved in the seeming contradiction. Most of the statements in these columns about "the collapse of the churches" have been written by me, very true; but this particular paragraph about the Sunday Schools was written not by me but by Dr. Charles F. Dole. The failure in consistency is one of the faults of a paper to which several minds contribute their opinions without any attempt at single editorial control—or is it one of the merits!

You speak of "reading in almost every news letter concerning the travels and itineraries of Dr. John Haynes Holmes that the churches in every town where he speaks are practically empty (while people throng the hall where he is speaking)." Now this is interesting and a bit ludicrous, if true; but is it true? Let us see!

My last "Items from a Traveler's Note-Book" was published in the February 28th UNITY, pages 374-375. In this article I find only one reference to churches, and this is where I speak of the "wonderful churches" in Cleveland. If this phrase has any connotation, it is one of prosperity, isn't it, and not of failure. But if I did not refer generally to churches in this article, I did refer to synagogues. Thus I spoke of Rabbi Silver's new temple, with its "great auditorium for some 2,600 people." Speaking of Rabbi Goldman's temple, I said—"Seating 1,800 people . . ., it holds regularly an audience of not less than 1,500." Is this "practically empty"? If you will read this article again, dear friend, I think you will find that I took pains to emphasize that I found churches and synagogues alike flourishing.

And what did I say in this article about myself and my audiences? In Erie I had "an audience that practically filled the auditorium." Does this mean that the "people throng(ed) the hall"? In Cleveland I say that I addressed a certain "large and lively forum." I see no relation here expressed between the size of the audience and the capacity of the hall. As a matter of fact, the hall was filled—but I didn't say so! In Youngstown, I report simply that "I addressed a forum audience," and in Elyria "an eager forum audience" ("eager" because I was three-quarters of an hour late, and they waited until I came). But in neither case did I make any mention of the size of these audiences. To quote your own words, Mr. Piper—"What is the matter?" Why do you misquote and misinterpret me in this fashion?

But I am interested in this matter. Let's go on! My next previous "Items" appeared on August 2nd, and described a trip to Nova Scotia. In this case there is no question of my audiences at all, as I made no addresses. I described four churches, however, in St. John and Wolfville. I visited these churches personally. I counted the congregations; in one case (a union service) I reported "some two hundred people," in another (a union service) "less than one hundred," in another case "between two hundred and three hundred persons," and in my last case "only thirty-four people." This report, it seems to me, answers your inquiry as to whether I am "making a real investigation" or basing my ideas "upon mere guesses." May I further point out that, in the case of the third of the four churches above referred to, I had this to say: "The character of the congregation was as impressive as its numbers. . . . At last I had found an encouraging church."

The next "Items" that I find, appeared in the issue of UNITY dated June 28th. This describes a visit to North Caro-

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

WHEN CONSCRIPTION ENDS

Drafters of peace plans might gain some useful hints from a study of the position of Bulgaria at the present moment. Spokesmen for that country are loudly bewailing the fact that, under the terms of the Treaty of Neuilly, Bulgaria is wide open to any form of foreign aggression. The treaty imposed by the Allies limited the Bulgarians to a standing army of 20,000, to be made up of voluntary recruits enlisting for not longer than twelve years. Under these conditions the government has found it impossible to maintain an army. The Bulgarians are a peasant people and, now that they cannot be conscripted, they till their acres and tend their flocks and laugh at recruiting officers. The government made a desperate appeal to the Allies for the right to conscript up to the number stipulated, but met with a firm rebuff. It is probably a serious matter to lack an army in the Balkans, where neighbors are rapacious and ancient enmities fester. The complaints, however, come from the official classes. Herding their sheep on the slopes of the Rhopodes and raising their crops along the Wild Kamchik, the common people of Bulgaria probably care nothing for national ambitions, and bless the day when the Treaty of Neuilly was signed.

If every country in Europe were in the same position the day of universal peace would be drawing close. The lack of a standing army keeps aggressive policies in check. Armies of war-making size can be maintained only by conscription, it seems. Germany, Russia and France could not have built up their great forces by any other system than compulsory service. Great Britain has been able to maintain a volunteer army of sorts, but it was never larger than was needed to police her overseas possessions.

Men will volunteer in the heat of conflict and under the urge of national peril, but few will accept in times of peace the tedium of barrack life and the harsh discipline of the drill sergeant.

It would be a fine thing for the cause of peace if another Treaty of Neuilly could be drawn up to apply, this time, to the whole of Europe; to victor and vanquished alike, limiting sea and air and land power and making all forms of conscription a thing of the past.

—*Saturday Evening Post.*

A PLEDGE AGAINST WAR

[The War Resisters' International is circulating the following pledge. We are glad to help on the good work.—J. H. H.]

I declare it to be my intention never to take part in war, offensive or defensive, international or civil, whether it be by bearing arms, making or handling munitions, voluntarily subscribing to war loans or using my labor for the purpose of setting others free for war service.

Name .....

Address .....

Occupation .....

This declaration may be signed and mailed to the American Section of the War Resisters' International, Peace House, Fifth Ave. and 110 St., New York (Jessie W. Hughan, Secretary).

Additional declarations and leaflets will be sent on request.

Reprinted After Many Years—

Of Making One's Self Beautiful

By

WILLIAM CHANNING GANNETT

Author of
"The Faith That Makes Faithful," "Blessed Be Drudgery," "A Year of Miracle," etc.

The five sermons comprising this book represent the rich culture and wisdom in the personal conduct of life of Dr. Gannett's mature years.

"Of Faces and Their Making" describes the remaking of faces "from within." In "Culture Without College" we meet the three teachers available to all—work, society, books, and we are shown how to get the fullest value from them. In "The Thorn Bearer" those handicapped in life's struggle may find how to turn a weakness into a source of strength. The great sufferers who have been "guides to the inner springs of cheer" meet us in "A Recipe for Good Cheer, and tell us their secret and how to use it. "The House Beautiful" analyzes a beautiful home into its essential elements.

Felicity of phrase, grace, charm, humor—characterize all these sermons, which abound in happy illustrations. No better guide could be in the hands of the earnest youth who seeks to shape life to worthy ends. The thoughtful reader will find in Dr. Gannett's sermons a well of inspiration and a sound philosophy.

In harmony with the intrinsic worth of this book are its attractive brown and gold cloth covers and the neat printing in large type on heavy wove paper.

The price is $1.25 a copy. Plus about 10 cents for postage.

THE STRATFORD COMPANY, *Publishers,*
234-240 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

lina to give a Commencement address at the North Carolina College for Women, and makes no reference to churches except to a certain community church, of which I make an enthusiastic report. I speak of my commencement audience as "crowded to the doors," but this was a commencement audience, and had nothing to do with me.

Going back in my files, I find my next "Items" in the April 19th issue of this paper. I here speak of my audience in Harrisburg as "small," my meeting in Erie as having "a good attendance," my audience in Wheeling as one that "comfortably filled the main floor of the synagogue," my forum audience in Louisville as numbering "some seven or eight hundred people." My five St. Louis audiences I do not describe at all, except to say that my last one was "an informal gathering of some thirty men and women." All this is very different, it strikes me, from your charge that my news letters describe people as thronging the halls where I speak. As for other churches, I find no mention of them at all in this letter, except in the case of "a host of hard-shell churches" in Wheeling.

I am persuaded from this survey, my dear Dr. Piper, that you have done me an injustice. But I know it was not intended, and I do not object. You sent me an interesting letter, and gave me a good chance to reply. But next time, make sure of your facts. This is what I am trying to do on this church question. When I find facts, I report them. I hope that you will do the same. Eventually, by this scientific method, we may discover what the situation is.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

METAPHYSICAL HEALING

Editor of UNITY:

Have read and rejoiced in you for years, but I heartily agree with the remarks of May Barris. You can't take one half of Jesus' command—"Preach the Gospel and heal the sick"—and let the other half slip. I have seen too many cases of uplifted lives through the results of metaphysical healing to doubt it, if I hadn't known it through my own healing. Why not let all live the life of the spirit as best they can? Your UNITY and Kansas City *Unity* both find a place on my table.

Yours for all aspects of truth,

M. H. BROWN.

UNITY FINDS A NEW FRIEND IN GERMANY

Editor of UNITY:

I beg to thank you for your kind letter of Jan. 29th, and am also very thankful to my old friend Mr. F——— of Leonia for his having subscribed for the journal UNITY for me. I have read the numbers received so far and have found within them a large number of articles and sentences which I am sure would do a great deal of good in my country if they could be published in German and could find a spreading as wide as possible. . . .

Dresden, Feb. 27th, 1924. PAUL KRAIS.

A RETURN TO THE FOLD

Editor of UNITY:

I want to renew my subscription to UNITY. I have let it lapse for some years, but it has always meant so much that I want to go back to it again. I would like also a dozen copies of "A Modern Ten Commandments," a copy of which appeared in the July 4, 1918, number. These numbers, held by an overzealous but not very far-visioned postal authority, are responsible for my return to the fold. They came to me last summer. I have been looking them over trying to discover just why they were not delivered in 1918. Truly in them lay more vision, more true Americanism than has been evidenced in our Washington policies since 1920. "Without vision the people perish," but it seems that the cost to those who have the vision is enormous. They have the faith and the hope and the prayers of the world that wants peace and progress to buoy them up. To Jenkin Lloyd Jones of blessed memory I pledge faith and hope.

Yours sincerely,

DORA C. DEIS.

UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE IN 1925

The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work is to be held in Stockholm, Sweden, August 11-31, 1925. The conference will be constituted by official delegates from the churches of many lands, who, however, will have no authority to bind their own churches in any way. The Swedish government has offered to be the host of official delegates.

The purpose of the Conference is not primarily to promote the reunion of Christendom, though such co-operation as is proposed may contribute to this end. It does not intend to deal with questions of Faith and Order. The purpose is rather to concentrate the thought of Christendom on the mind of Christ as revealed in the Gospels toward those great social, industrial and international questions which are so acutely urgent in our civilization.

The members of the Executive Committee urge their fellow Christians of every race and country to pray, now and continually:

"For the coming of a fuller unity of spirit and of action in the entire Church of Christ throughout the world;

"For a readiness on the part of all Christians to make new ventures of faith and to take more seriously the implications of the Gospel;

"For the deepening and broadening of love among all Christ's followers toward all men;

"For the elimination of all passion and prejudice, and the growth of peace and brotherhood;

"For clearer vision of the will of God and of the work of Christ in this day;

"For all that may further the coming of His Rule on earth."

The program of the Conference will include the following subjects, which are to have been studied carefully by commissions in the various countries:

1. The Church's Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World.
2. The Church and Economic and Industrial Problems.
3. The Church and Social and Moral Problems.
4. The Church and International Relations.
5. The Church and Christian Education.
6. Methods of Co-operative and Federative Efforts by the Christian Communions.

The American sections of these reports are now being prepared.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
608 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Scrupulous Care
Nothing is left undone to protect the purity of BOWMAN'S MILK.
Frequent inspections, perfect pasteurization and rapid, direct delivery contribute to the safety of BOWMAN'S MILK.
BOWMAN DAIRY Company

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.
Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .
Your savings and checking account cordially invited
Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

MAY
Is the month for the year's greatest cleaning. The home's cold weather drapes and rugs, blankets and comforters, heavy motor robes, should all be cleansed before putting them away. Summer cretonnes and slip covers should be made ready for service. Send work here in confidence of its being done by the latest equipment and methods.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY